



"RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116-
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE EXAMINING
GROUP 1723"

#10
3-1-03

RECEIVED
FEB 27 2003
TC 1700

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

Kensaku KOMATSU, et al.

: GROUP ART UNIT: 1723

SERIAL NO.: 09/884,084

:

FILED: JUNE 20, 2001

: EXAMINER: FORTUNA, ANA M.

FOR: POROUS HOLLOW FIBER MEMBRANES AND METHOD OF MAKING THE
SAME

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

SIR:

In response to the Office Action dated November 22, 2002, please reconsider the application in view of the following amendment and remarks.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Claims 1-30 will be active in this application. Claims 6-28 stand withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to non-elected subject matter.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

The present invention as set forth in **Claim 1** relates to a porous hollow fiber membrane obtained by a method comprising
preparing a spinning dope containing microparticles;
forming said hollow fiber membrane from said spinning dope according to a dry-wet spinning method or a wet spinning method to obtain a spun hollow fiber membrane; and
extracting and removing said microparticles by immersing said spun hollow fiber

membrane into an extracting solution;

wherein said hollow fiber membrane has a permselectivity; wherein a particle cutoff is within the range of 1 to 10 μm ; and wherein a pure water permeate flow is equal to or higher than 30,000 $\text{L/m}^2/\text{hr}/100\text{kPa}$.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Fortuna for her helpful and courteous discussion with Applicants' Representative on February 4, 2003. During this discussion it was noted that the **newly cited** references, Parham et al and Stengaard, neither disclose nor suggest the claimed membrane having a **particle cutoff of 1 to 10 μm** or the claimed **water permeate flow**. In fact, Parham et al disclose a membrane having a pore diameter of **about 0.1 to about 0.7 microns** (Parham et al, col. 7, lines 49 and 50) which is much smaller than the claimed particle cutoff of **1 to 10 μm** . There is no suggestion or motivation to go to a higher pore size as this would be detrimental to the filtration capability of the membrane for LDL cholesterol. In addition, the term "microporous" in Parham et al does not refer to pores of 0.02 to 10 microns as argued by the Examiner. Parham et al have chosen a specific pores size so that LDL cholesterol can be filtered from whole blood. Parham et al state at col. 7, lines 41-50 as follows:

" The dimensional and porosity characteristics of the membranes of this invention are such that **LDL-C can pass through the fiber wall but most blood cells do not**. Hemolysis occurs if numerous blood cells pass through the fibers, **which is highly undesirable**.....Generally speaking, membranes can be prepared which possess a pore diameter of between about 0.1 microns to about 0.7 microns, preferably between 0.4 and 0.65 microns."

Thus, Parham et al clearly teach away from larger pore sizes as they would lead to undesirable hemolysis. In addition, since the membrane of Parham et al does not have the claimed pore size it **cannot have the claimed water permeate flow**. This is further shown by Comparison Example 2 at page 33 of the specification. Here a membrane with a particle

cutoff of **0.85 micron** was prepared. The corresponding pure water permeate flow is only **22,000 L/m²/hr/100kPa**, which is much lower than the **claimed** pure water permeate flow of **30,000 L/m²/hr/100kPa**. A smaller pore size such as disclosed in Parham et al would yield an even smaller pure water permeate flow.

Stengaard does not cure these defects because it also fails to disclose or suggest the claimed membrane having a particle cutoff of 1 to 10 μ m or the claimed water permeate flow.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-8, 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Parham et al and the rejection of Claims 5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Parham et al in view of Stengaard is believed to be unsustainable as the present invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to the Restriction Requirement, Applicants appreciate that the Examiner is considering Claims 6-9, 29 and 30 together with Claims 1-5. Applicants also appreciate the indication of a rejoinder of Claims 10-28 after allowability of the above Claims has been determined.

In addition, Applicants appreciate that the Examiner has sent signed copies of all IDS filed in this application by facsimile on December 20, 2002. However, with respect to the Form PTO-1449 of March 6, 2002, it appears on the facsimile copy that the second reference (U.S. 5,976,433) has not been initialed. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner sends another copy of **Form PTO-1449 of March 6, 2002**, in which the second reference has been initialed as well.

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance and early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Kirsten Grueneberg
Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No.: 24,618



Kirsten A. Grueneberg, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 47,297

22850

PHONE NO.: (703) 413-3000
FAX NO.: (703) 413-2220
NFO:KAG:lcd
I:\user\KGRUN\209991.am.wpd